arXiv:1509.09219v1 [math.MG] 30 Sep 2015

Fractal Curves and Rugs of Prescribed Conformal Dimension

Claudio A. DiMarco[a]

[a] *103 Fisher Hall, 300 Campus Drive, Division of Physical and Computational Sciences, University of Pittsburgh at Bradford, Bradford, PA 16701*

Abstract

We construct Jordan arcs of prescribed conformal dimension which are minimal for conformal dimension. These curves are used to design fractal rugs, similar to Rickman's rug, that are also minimal for conformal dimension. These fractal rugs could potentially settle a standing conjecture regarding the existence of metric spaces of prescribed topological conformal dimension.

Keywords: metric space, Cantor sets, Hausdorff dimension, conformal dimension, topological dimension, quasisymmetric map.
2010 MSC: Primary 28A80, 30L10; Secondary 28A78, 54F45

1. Introduction

Let (X, d) be a metric space. The subscripts of dim indicate the type of dimension, and we set $\dim \varnothing = -1$ for every dimension.

Quasisymmetric maps form an interesting intermediate class lying between homeomorphisms and bi-Lipschitz maps [7, 9]. Topological dimension is invariant under homeomorphisms, and Hausdorff dimension is bi-Lipschitz invariant. Conformal dimension classifies metric spaces up to quasisymmetric equivalence [12]:

Definition 1.1. The *conformal dimension of* X is

$$\dim_C X = \inf\{\dim_H f(X) : f \text{ is quasisymmetric}\}.$$

It is clear from the definition that conformal dimension is invariant under quasisymmetric maps, and hence under bi-Lipschitz maps.

Pansu introduced conformal dimension in 1989 [13], and the concept has been widely studied since. The primary applications of the theory of conformal dimension are in the study of Gromov hyperbolic spaces and their boundaries. The boundary of a Gromov hyperbolic space admits a family of metrics which are not bi-Lipschitz equivalent, but quasisymmetrically equivalent. Consequently,

Email address: cdimarco@pitt.edu (Claudio A. DiMarco)

the conformal dimension of the boundary is well-defined, unlike its Hausdorff dimension [12]. Recent advancements involving applications of conformal dimension are exposed in [3] and [4]. Determining the conformal dimension of the Sierpinskí carpet (denoted $\dim_C SC$) is an open problem, but in [10] Keith and Laakso proved that $\dim_C SC < \dim_H SC$. Kovalev proved a conjecture of Tyson: conformal dimension does not take values strictly between 0 and 1 [11]. In [8] Hakobyan proved that if $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a uniformly perfect middle-interval Cantor set, then $\dim_H E = \dim_C E$ if and only if $\dim_H E = 1$.

Definition 1.2. A metric space X is called *minimal for conformal dimension* if $\dim_C X = \dim_H X$.

In [5] topological conformal dimension was defined; it is an adaptation of *topological Hausdorff dimension* which was defined in [1] as

$$\dim_{tH} X = \inf\{d : X \text{ has a basis } \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } \dim_H \partial U \leq d-1 \text{ for all } U \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

Definition 1.3. The topological conformal dimension of X is

$$\dim_{tC} X = \inf\{d : X \text{ has basis } \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } \dim_C \partial U \leq d-1 \text{ for all } U \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

There is a key difference between conformal dimension and tC-dimension. Lower bounds for the former can be obtained through the presence of "diffuse" families of curves, while diffuse families of surfaces provide lower bounds for the latter. For precise statements, see Theorem 4.5 in [5] and Proposition 4.1.3 in [12]. While Fact 4.1 in [5] shows $\dim_{tC} X \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \cup [2, \infty]$, it is unknown whether tC-dimension attains all values in $[2, \infty]$.

The following conjecture was posed in [5]:

Conjecture 1.4. For every $d \in [2, \infty]$ there is a metric space X with $\dim_{tC} X = d$.

In this paper we provide examples of fractal spaces that could potentially settle Conjecture 1.4. To this end, it seems appropriate to consider topological squares that are not quasisymmetrically equivalent to $[0, 1]^2$. A classical fractal of this kind is *Rickman's rug*, which is the cartesian product of the von Koch snowflake with the standard unit interval. In general, a *fractal rug* is a product space of the form $R_d = V_d \times [0, 1]$, where V_d is a Jordan arc (a space homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$) with $d = \dim_C V_d$. At present, we do not have the tools necessary to determine the tC-dimensions of these fractals, but we suspect that $\dim_H R_d = \dim_{tC} R_d$. This would be consistent with the fact that R_d is minimal for conformal dimension, which follows from a result of Bishop and Tyson [12]. Since spaces of prescribed Hausdorff dimension are easily obtained (see e.g. Remark 4.1 below), the equality $\dim_H R_d = \dim_{tC} R_d$ would provide an affirmative answer to the question of existence in Conjecture 1.4.

In Section 3 we discuss fractal rugs and their dimensions in the context of Conjecture 1.4. In Section 4 we construct the Jordan arcs that are discussed in Section 3, which is the main result of the paper:

Theorem 1.5. *For every $c \geq 1$ there is a Jordan arc Λ with $\dim_C \Lambda = c$.*

2. Preliminaries

The symbol $B(x,\varepsilon)$ denotes the open ball centered at x of radius ε. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|x|$ is the Euclidean modulus of x. Unless otherwise stated, distance in the metric space Y is denoted d_Y. To discuss conformal dimension, we need the notion of quasisymmetry. A quasisymmetric map allows for rescaling with aspect ratio control:

Definition 2.1. An embedding $f : X \to Y$ is *quasisymmetric* if there is a homeomorphism $\eta : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ so that

$$\frac{d_Y(f(x), f(a))}{d_Y(f(x), f(b))} \leq \eta\left(\frac{d_X(x,a)}{d_X(x,b)}\right)$$

for all triples a, b, x of points in X with $x \neq b$ [12].

Conformal dimension is defined via Hausdorff dimension. For the latter, recall the following definition.

Definition 2.2. The *p-dimensional Hausdorff measure* of X is

$$\mathcal{H}^p(X) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \inf\left\{\sum (\operatorname{diam} E_j)^p : X \subset \bigcup E_j \text{ and } \operatorname{diam} E_j \leq \delta \ \forall j\right\}.$$

The *Hausdorff dimension* of X is $\dim_H X = \inf\{p : \mathcal{H}^p(X) = 0\}$.

An interesting combination of the Hausdorff and topological dimensions called *topological Hausdorff dimension* was introduced in [1]:

$$\dim_{tH} X = \inf\{d : X \text{ has a basis } \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } \dim_H \partial U \leq d-1 \ \forall U \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

In certain favorable circumstances, both of these dimensions are additive under products. For sake of completeness, we include Theorem 4.21 from [1].

Theorem 2.3. *If X is a nonempty separable metric space, then*

$$\dim_{tH}(X \times [0,1]) = \dim_H(X \times [0,1]) = \dim_H X + 1. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular, $\dim_{tH} R$ *can attain any value greater than* 2 *[1].*

The first inequality in (2.1) is due to Balka, Buczolich, and Elekes [1]. The second inequality is a generalization of Product Formula 7.3 in [6], which is a well-known result. Let $\overline{\dim}_H X$ be the upper box-counting dimension of X (see e.g. [6]). If $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are Borel sets with $\dim_H X = \overline{\dim}_B X$, then Corollary 7.4 in [6] yields $\dim_H(X \times Y) = \dim_H X + \dim_H Y$. The condition $\dim_H X = \overline{\dim}_B X$ holds for a wide variety of spaces, including *uniform Cantor sets* (see Example 4.5 in [6]).

Hausdorff dimension is invariant under *bi-Lipschitz maps*.

Definition 2.4. An embedding f is *L-bi-Lipschitz* if both f and f^{-1} are L-Lipschitz, and we say f is *bi-Lipschitz* if it is L-bi-Lipschitz for some L.

Every bi-Lipschitz map is quasisymmetric, but not every quasisymmetric map is bi-Lipschitz.

We are now prepared to define conformal dimension, which measures the distortion of Hausdorff dimension by quasisymmetric maps.

Definition 2.5. The *conformal dimension of* X is

$$\dim_C X = \inf\{\dim_H f(X) : f \text{ is quasisymmetric}\}.$$

In case $\dim_C X = \dim_H X$ we say that X is *minimal for conformal dimension.* Bishop and Tyson proved that for every compact set $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the space $Z = Y \times [0,1]$ is minimal for conformal dimension [12]. The following string of inequalities is a useful tool for determining dimensions. The first two comprise Proposition 2.2 in [5], while the third is evident considering Definition 2.5.

Proposition 2.6. *If X is a metric space, then*

$$\dim_t X \leq \dim_{tC} X \leq \dim_C X \leq \dim_H X.$$

For any product space $X \times Y$, we use the metric

$$d((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = \max(d_X(x_1, x_2), d_Y(y_1, y_2)).$$

A *Jordan arc* is an arc of a Jordan curve; that is, a homeomorphic image of $[0,1]$ with the usual topology.

3. Rickman's Rug

Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. The *snowflake mapping* $([0,1], |\cdot|) \to ([0,1], |\cdot|^\varepsilon)$ is quasisymmetric [9], and we write $[0,1]^\varepsilon$ for the target space. It is readily seen that $\dim_H ([0,1]^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-1}$. Regardless of the choice of $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, one has $\dim_C ([0,1]^\varepsilon) = 1$ since the inverse of a quasisymmetric map is again quasisymmetric. Equivalently, one can obtain the metric space $[0,1]^\varepsilon$ by choosing an appropriate scaling factor and following the construction of the classical von Koch snowflake. From this point forward, when the value $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ is unimportant for our discussion, we will write $V = [0,1]^\varepsilon$ and refer to $R = V \times [0,1]$ as *Rickman's rug.* We use the term *fractal rug* for a product space of the form $R_d = V_d \times [0,1]$, where V_d is a Jordan arc with $d = \dim_C V_d$. As usual, this product is equipped with the metric

$$d((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = \max(|x_1 - x_2|^\varepsilon, |y_1 - y_2|).$$

The case $\varepsilon = \frac{\ln(3)}{\ln(4)}$ corresponds to the aforementioned von Koch snowflake curve.

Since R is homeomorphic to $[0,1]^2$, $\dim_t R = 2$. Tukia proved that R is not quasisymmetrically equivalent to $[0,1]^2$ [12]. In fact, Example 4.1.9 in [12] shows that R is minimal for conformal dimension, meaning $\dim_C R = \dim_H R = 1+\varepsilon^{-1}$, where the last equality follows from Theorem 4.2 in [1]. We can compute the tH and tC dimensions of R. Here is a simple way to compute the tC-dimension of R.

Fact 3.1. $\dim_{tC} R = 2$.

Proof. Since V is a Jordan arc, Theorem 3.7 in [5] implies $\dim_{tC} R \leq 2$. The reverse inequality holds since $2 = \dim_t R \leq \dim_{tC} R$ by Proposition 2.6. □

It is not clear how to compute the topological conformal dimension of more general fractal rugs. The difficulty in determining $\dim_{tC} R_d$ lies in giving a non-trivial lower bound. Theorem 3.7 in [5] yields the upper bound $\dim_{tC} R_d \leq d+1$, but a lower bound takes into account the conformal dimension of the boundary of an arbitrary open subset of R_d, which can be quite bizarre.

In view of Fact 3.1, Rickman's rug cannot be used to answer Conjecture 1.4. To accomplish that goal, one needs a more general construction. One approach is to try to compute $\dim_{tC} R_d$ for $d > 1$, but in order to do this, one first needs to construct V_d with $d > 1$. The idea of the following conjecture is to prescribe a number $c \geq 1$, then use Theorem 4.2 to obtain V_{c-1} and ultimately show that $\dim_{tC} R_{c-1} = c$.

Conjecture 3.2. For any $c \geq 1$ there is a Jordan arc V_{c-1} such that $\dim_{tC}(V_{c-1} \times [0,1]) = c$.

This conjecture seems reasonable if one hopes to prove it by showing that $\dim_H R_{c-1} = \dim_{tC} R_{c-1}$. In particular, it would follow from Proposition 2.6 that $\dim_C R_{c-1} = \dim_H R_{c-1} = c$.

4. Jordan Arcs of Prescribed Conformal Dimension

In this section we show that for any number $c \geq 1$ there is a Jordan arc with conformal dimension c. The following is a modest yet useful remark on Cantor sets that will help us accomplish this task.

Remark 4.1. For any $a \in [0, \infty]$ there is a Cantor type set $K_a \subset [0,1]^n$ with $\dim_H K_a = a$ for large enough n. For instance, if N is the least positive integer such that $b = \frac{a}{N} < 1$, let $K_b \subset [0,1]$ be the Cantor set with $\dim_H K_b = b$ obtained by the usual construction with scaling factor $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$ defined by $b = \frac{\ln(2)}{\ln(\frac{1}{r})}$. Then $K_a = \prod_1^N K_b$ is a self-similar Cantor set, and $\dim_H K_a = \sum_1^N \dim_H K_b = a$ by Corollary 7.4 in [6].

Theorem 4.2. *For every $c \geq 1$ there is a Jordan arc Λ with $\dim_C \Lambda = c$.*

For $c = 1$ put $\Lambda = [0,1]$. We will need several lemmas to verify the case $c > 1$ in Theorem 4.2. The result will be shown for any number $c = 1 + d,\ d > 0$.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $0 < d < \infty$. Let E be the Cantor set constructed from the sequence of ratios $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ where $c_i \searrow 0$ as $i \to \infty$, and let $Y = K_d$ be the self-similar Cantor set with $\dim_H Y = d$ as in Remark 4.1. Then $\dim_C(E \times Y) = 1 + d$.*

Proof. We will show that E satisfies the conditions of Corollary 5.6 in [8] and the result will follow. First let us show that E is uniformly perfect. Since $\dim_H E = 1$, Corollary 3.3 in [8] will then imply $\dim_C E = 1$. To this end, let $x \in E$ and $r > 0$. Write $B(x,r) \cap E = B(x,r)$ for the open ball. Then for large enough k there is a kth generation interval $I_{k,j}$, for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, 2^k\}$, such that $x \in I_{k,j} \subset B(x,r)$. Choose the smallest such k. Then the length of $I_{k,j}$ is

$$m(I_{k,j}) = s_k = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(1-c_i)}{2^k}, \tag{4.1}$$

and $s_k < r \leq s_{k-1}$. Say $I_{k,j} = [a,b]$ so that $a, b \in E$. Then at least one of $|x-a| \geq \frac{s_k}{2}$ and $|x-b| \geq \frac{s_k}{2}$ holds. Say $|x-a| \geq \frac{s_k}{2}$. By (4.1),

$$\frac{s_{k-1}}{s_k} = \frac{2^k \prod_1^{k-1}(1-c_i)}{2^{k-1}\prod_1^k(1-c_i)} = \frac{2}{1-c_k} \leq \frac{2}{1-\sup_i c_i} = K. \tag{4.2}$$

Inequality (4.2) yields

$$|x-a| \geq \frac{s_k}{2} \geq \frac{s_{k-1}}{2K} \geq \frac{r}{2K}. \tag{4.3}$$

By (4.3) we have $a \in B(x,r) \setminus B(x, \frac{r}{4K}) \neq \varnothing$, and hence E is uniformly perfect. Since $\dim_H E = 1$, Corollary 3.3 in [8] gives $\dim_C E = 1$. That is, E is minimal for conformal dimension.

To satisfy Corollary 5.6 in [8] it remains to show that E supports a measure μ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a constant C so that whenever $x \in E$ and $r < \mathrm{diam} E$,

$$\frac{r^{1+\varepsilon}}{C} \leq \mu(B(x,r)) \leq C r^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Write $E = \bigcap_k E_k$ where $E_k = \bigcup_{j=1}^{2^k} I_{k,j}$ are the intervals used to construct E. Let μ_k be the probability measure supported on E_k that gives equal weight to each $I_{k,j}, j = 1, \ldots 2^k$. Since E is compact there is a subsequence $\mu_{k_i} \to \mu$ where μ is a probability measure supported on E. In particular $\mu(I_{k,j}) = \mu_k(I_{k,j}) = \frac{1}{2^k}$ for all k, j. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $x \in E$ and $0 < r < \mathrm{diam} E$. Choose k in the same manor as in the proof of uniform perfectness of E. For some $j \in \{1, \ldots, 2^k\}$ we have $x \in I_{k,j} \subset B(x,r)$. Since $s_{k-1} \geq r$,

$$2^{k-1} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(1-c_i)}{s_{k-1}} \leq \frac{1}{r}, \tag{4.4}$$

so by (4.4)

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \geq \mu(I_{k,j}) = \mu_k(I_{k,j}) = \frac{1}{2^k} \geq \frac{r}{2}. \tag{4.5}$$

By choice of k it follows from (4.5) that at most three intervals of generation $k-1$ intersect $B(x,r)$, each with $\mu(I_{k-1,j}) = \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}$. Therefore $\mu(B(x,r)) \leq$

$3\mu(I_{k-1,j}) = \frac{3}{2^{k-1}}$. Since $s_k < r$ it suffices to show that there is a constant C such that

$$\frac{3}{2^{k-1}} \le C s_k^{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{C\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (1-c_i)\right)^{1-\varepsilon}}{2^{k(1-\varepsilon)}}$$

That is, we must show that there is C such that $a_k \le C$, where

$$a_k = \frac{6(2^{-k\varepsilon})}{\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (1-c_i)\right)^{1-\varepsilon}}. \tag{4.6}$$

Note that (4.6) implies $\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} = \frac{2_{-\varepsilon}}{(1-c_{n+1})^{1-\varepsilon}} \to 2^{-\varepsilon} < 1$ so that $\sum a_n < \infty$ and hence $a_n \to 0$. In particular, a_n is bounded so say $a_k \le C$ for all k. Finally

$$\frac{r^{1+\varepsilon}}{2} \le \mu(B(x,r)) \le C r^{1-\varepsilon}, \tag{4.7}$$

and by (4.7) there is a constant K such that $\frac{1}{K} r^{1+\varepsilon} \le \mu(B(x,r) \cap E) \le K r^{1-\varepsilon}$. This shows that Corollary 5.6 in [8] is satisfied so that

$$\dim_C(E \times Y) \ge 1 + \dim_H Y = 1 + d.$$

Since E is a self-similar Cantor set, Example 4.5 and Corollary 7.4 in [6] yield

$$\dim_C(E \times Y) \le \dim_H(E \times Y) = \dim_H E + \dim_H Y = 1 + d.$$

Therefore $\dim_C(E \times Y) = 1 + d$. □

In [7], Gehring and Väisälä constructed a quasiconformal mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which maps one n-dimensional Cantor set onto another. Their construction involves a sequence of piecewise linear mappings, and we use that idea to produce a Jordan arc containing a (sufficiently large) product of Cantor sets.

Lemma 4.4. *Let E and $Y \subset [0,1]^n$ be as in Lemma 4.3. There is a Jordan arc $\Lambda \subset [0,1]^{n+1}$ such that $\Lambda \supset (E \times Y)$.*

Proof. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we will construct curves Γ_k such that $\Gamma = \bigcup_k \Gamma_k$ and $\Lambda = \overline{\Gamma}$. Since $Y \subset [0,1]^n$ is a product of n copies of the same Cantor set, we see that $F_1 = E_1 \times Y_1$ is the first generation of $E \times Y$, where $E_1 = I_{1,1} \cup I_{1,2}$ and $Y_1 = \bigcup_{i_1,\ldots,i_n=1,2} (J_{1,i_1} \times \cdots \times J_{1,i_n})$. Then

$$F_1 = \bigcup_{j,i_1,\ldots,i_n=1,2} I_{1,j} \times (J_{1,i_1} \times \cdots \times J_{1,i_n}) \tag{4.8}$$

is a union of $t_1 = 2^{n+1}$ disjoint products whose sides are rectangles. Let us say $F_1 = \bigcup_{s=1}^{t_1} Q_s^1$ where $\operatorname{dist}(Q_1^1, 0) < \operatorname{dist}(Q_2^1, 0) \le \cdots \le \operatorname{dist}(Q_{t_1-1}, 0) < \operatorname{dist}(Q_{t_1}^1, 0)$. For each s there are unique points $x_s^1, y_s^1 \in Q_s^1$ with $|x_s^1| = \operatorname{dist}(Q_s^1, 0)$ and $|y_s^1| = \max\{|z| : z \in Q_s^1\}$. For $s = 1, \ldots, t_1 - 1$ there is a simple curve γ_s^1 in

$[0,1]^{n+1}$ from y_s^1 to x_{s+1}^1. Since $n+1 \geq 2$ we may choose these $2^{n+1}-1$ curves to be disjoint.

Parametrize these curves by first dividing the interval $[0,1]$ into $2(2^{n+1}-1)+1 = 2^{n+2}-1$ subintervals of equal length. Call them

$$P_j^1 = \left[\frac{j}{2^{n+2}-1}, \frac{j+1}{2^{n+2}-1}\right], \quad 0 \leq j \leq 2^{n+2}-2.$$

Choose smooth parametrized curves $\gamma_1^1, \ldots, \gamma_{t_1-1}^1 \subset F_1^c$ for odd j:

$$\hat{\gamma}_j^1 : P_j^1 \to \gamma_j^1 \quad \text{(see Figure 1 for the case } n=1\text{)}.$$

For this we call $\{P_j^1 : j \text{ odd}\}$ *used* and $\{P_j^1 : j \text{ even}\}$ *neglected*. Put $\Gamma_1 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{t_1-1} \gamma_j^1$. Note that there are $2^{n+2}-1-(2^{n+1}-1) = 2^{n+1} = t_1$ neglected subintervals of $[0,1]$ after this parametrization, which is the number of products in F_1. Reindex $\{P_j^1 : j \text{ even}\} = \{P_s^1\}_1^{t_1}$ in increasing order of distance from 0.

For each integer $1 \leq s \leq t_1$ we repeat the above path construction process for the pair P_s^1, Q_s^1. This gives $2^{2(n+1)}-1$ curves whose union we call Γ_2. Continuing in this fashion, we obtain for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the subintervals P_j^k, along with $2^{k(n+1)}-1$ curves, and their union Γ_k.

Let $\Gamma = \bigcup_k \Gamma_k$. It remains to show that $\overline{\Gamma}$ is a Jordan arc and that $(E \times Y) \subset \overline{\Gamma}$. The construction of Γ defines a function $f : D \to \Gamma$ where D is dense in [0,1]. We will show that f is uniformly continuous so that it extends to a continuous function $\tilde{f} : [0,1] \to \overline{\Gamma}$. Call $x \in D$ *k-used* if $x \in \bigcup_j P_j^k$, and call x *k-neglected* if $x \in \bigcap_j (P_j^k)^c$.

Let $\delta_k = m(P_1^k)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Take K to be the smallest integer such that $\operatorname{diam}(Q_1^K) = \cdots = \operatorname{diam}(Q_{t_K}^K) < \varepsilon$. Note that $\bigcup_i (\Gamma_{K+1} \cap Q_i^K)$ is composed of $t_{K+1} = 2^{(K+1)(n+1)} - 1$ disjoint paths. Let $\delta' = \frac{\delta_{K+1}}{2}$ and

$$L_K = \max\{L_{j,k} | \hat{\gamma}_j^k \text{ is } L_{j,k}\text{-Lipschitz}, j \text{ even}, 1 \leq k \leq K\} \tag{4.9}$$

Put $\delta = \min\left\{\delta', \frac{\varepsilon}{2L_K}\right\}$. If $x, y \in D$ are such that $|x-y| < \delta$ then there are three possibilities. In any case, we must show $|f(x)-f(y)| < \varepsilon$.

1. **Both x and y are $(K+1)$-used.** Then $x, y \in Q_j^K$ for some j, hence $|f(x)-f(y)| \leq \operatorname{diam}(Q_j^K) = \operatorname{diam}(Q_1^K) < \varepsilon$.

2. **Both x and y are $(K+1)$-neglected.** Since $|x-y| < \frac{\delta_{K+1}}{2}$ it follows that either (a), (b), or (c) holds.



Figure 1: For $n = 1$ and $\dim_H Y = \frac{\ln(2)}{\ln(3)}$, these line segments are examples of smooth curves that might comprise the first two generations of Γ. Taking the closure of the union of all such segments results in a Jordan arc with the desired conformal dimension.

(a) $x, y \in P_s^{K+1}$ **for some** s**.** Then $f(x), f(y) \in f(D \cap P_s^{K+1}) \subset Q_s^{K+1}$ so that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \operatorname{diam}(Q_1^K) < \varepsilon$.

(b) $x, y \in P_j^k$ **for some** $k \leq K$. By (4.9) we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| = |\hat{\gamma}_j^k(x) - \hat{\gamma}_j^k(y)| \leq L_{j,k}|x - y| \leq L_K \frac{\varepsilon}{2L_K} = \varepsilon/2.$$

(c) x **is** k**-used for some** $k \leq K$ **and** $y \in P_s^{K+1}$ **for some** s. Say $x \in P_j^k, j \leq K$ and $P_j^k = [a, b]$. Then $f(a) = x_{j+1}^k$ is the corner of Q_{j+1}^k closest to 0. By construction $f(a)$ is also the corner of Q_r^{K+1} closest to 0 for some r. Since $|y - a| \leq |y - x| < \frac{1}{2}\delta_{K+1}$, there are no $(K+1)$-used intervals between y and a. Therefore $f(P_s^{K+1}) \subset Q_r^{K+1}$ so that

$$|f(y) - f(a)| \leq \operatorname{diam}(Q_r^{K+1}) < \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{diam}(Q_1^K) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Also (b) implies $|f(a) - f(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, so

$$|f(y) - f(x)| \leq |f(y) - f(a)| + |f(a) - f(x)| < \varepsilon.$$

3. x **is** $(K+1)$**-used and** y **is** $(K+1)$**-neglected.** Without loss of generality we assume $y < x$. Say $x \in P_j^{K+1}$. Then $y \in P_{j-1}^{K+1}$. Note that $f(x)$ lies on a curve connecting two products Q_s^{K+1}, Q_{s+1}^{K+1} for some s. By construction $f(y) \in Q_s^{K+1}$ so that $f(x), f(y) \in Q_i^K$ for some i. Thus $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \operatorname{diam}(Q_i^K) < \varepsilon$.

So f is uniformly continuous on D, and a continuous extension $\tilde{f} : [0,1] \to \overline{\Gamma}$ exists. We show that $\tilde{f}$ is injective. Let $x \neq y$ for $x, y \in [0,1]$. If $x, y \in D$ then either $f(x)$ and $f(y)$ lie on disjoint arcs so that $f(x) \neq f(y)$, or they lie on the same curve γ_j^k in which case $f(x) \neq f(y)$ because $\hat{\gamma}_j^k$ is injective. If $x, y \in D^c$ then there is a used interval P_j^k between x and y. By construction, $f(x) \in Q_i^k$ and $f(y) \in Q_l^k$ for some $i \neq l$, so $f(x) \neq f(y)$. If $x \in D$ and $y \in D^c$, then there is a used interval P_j^k strictly between x and y and the above argument implies $f(x) \neq f(y)$. Then $\tilde{f}$ is a continuous bijection whose domain is compact, so it is a homeomorphism and hence $\overline{\Gamma}$ is a Jordan arc. To see that $(E \times Y) \subset \overline{\Gamma}$, let $z \in E \times Y$ and note that $z \in Q_{j_k}^k$ for infinitely many k and $\overline{\Gamma} \cap Q_{j_k}^k \neq \varnothing$ for all k. Choose $z_k \in Q_{j_k}^k \cap \overline{\Gamma}$ for each k. Then $|z - z_k| \leq \operatorname{diam}(Q_{j_k}^k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Since $\overline{\Gamma}$ is compact, $z \in \overline{\Gamma}$, so $(E \times Y) \subset \overline{\Gamma} = \Lambda$. □

We now prove Theorem 4.2 with $\Lambda = \overline{\Gamma}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 we have $\dim_C \overline{\Gamma} \geq \dim_C(E \times Y) = 1 + d$. Note that $\Gamma \setminus (E \times Y)$ is a countable union of disjoint smooth curves of Hausdorff dimension 1 so that $\dim_H(\Gamma \setminus (E \times Y)) = 1$. Also $\partial\Gamma \subset (E \times Y)$ so that $\overline{\Gamma} \setminus (E \times Y) = \Gamma \setminus (E \times Y)$. The stability and additivity properties of Hausdorff dimension yield

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H \overline{\Gamma} &= \max\{\dim_H(\overline{\Gamma} \setminus (E \times Y)), \dim_H(E \times Y)\} \\ &= \max\{1, 1 + d\} \\ &= 1 + d. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

It follows from (4.10) and Proposition 2.6 that $\dim_C \overline{\Gamma} \leq 1 + d$, and hence $\dim_C \Lambda = \dim_C \overline{\Gamma} = 1 + d = c$. □

Corollary 4.5. Let V_{c-1} be as in Conjecture 3.2. Then

$$\dim_C R_{c-1} = \dim_H R_{c-1} = c.$$

Theorem 4.2 guarantees the existence of the spaces R_d, but the value $\dim_{tC} R_d$ remains unknown. Since $\dim_{tC} R_d \leq \dim_C R_d$ by Proposition 2.6, Corollary 4.5 provides a crude upper bound on $\dim_{tC} R_d$. We do not know any non-trivial lower bounds. Indeed, without the presence of a diffuse family of surfaces, it is difficult to determine any nontrivial lower bound on $\dim_{tC} R_d$.

Question 4.6. *Determine* $\dim_{tC} R_d$.

Topological conformal dimension and topological Hausdorff dimension are related in the following way. For every metric space X,

$$\dim_{tC} X \leq \inf\{\dim_{tH} f(X) : f \text{ quasisymmetric}\}. \tag{4.11}$$

Question 6.4 in [5] asks whether equality holds in (4.11) for every X. It is not clear whether the tH-dimension of R_d can be lowered by quasisymmetric maps.

Question 4.7. *Given* $0 < d < \infty$, *is there a quasisymmetric mapping* f *such that* $\dim_{tH} f(R_d) < \dim_{tH} R_d$*?*

Acknowledgement

This paper is based on a part of a PhD thesis written by the author under the supervision of Leonid Kovalev at Syracuse University.

References

[1] Richard Balka, Zoltan Buczolich, and Marton Elekes, *A new fractal dimension: the topological Hausdorff dimension*, arXiv **1108.4292v2** (2013).

[2] Christopher J. Bishop and Jeremy T. Tyson, *Locally minimal sets for conformal dimension*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **26** (2001), no. 2, 361–373. MR1833245 (2002c:30027)

[3] Mario Bonk, *Quasiconformal geometry of fractals*, International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 1349–1373. MR2275649 (2008e:30028)

[4] Mario Bonk and Bruce Kleiner, *Conformal dimension and Gromov hyperbolic groups with 2-sphere boundary*, Geom. Topol. **9** (2005), 219–246 (electronic), DOI 10.2140/gt.2005.9.219. MR2116315 (2005k:20102)

[5] Claudio A. DiMarco, *Topological conformal dimension*, Conform. Geom. Dyn. **19** (2015), 19–34, DOI 10.1090/S1088-4173-2015-00274-X. MR3303179

[6] Kenneth Falconer, *Fractal geometry*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2003. Mathematical foundations and applications. MR2118797 (2006b:28001)

[7] F. W. Gehring and J. Väisälä, *Hausdorff dimension and quasiconformal mappings*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **6** (1973), 504–512. MR0324028 (48 #2380)

[8] Hrant Hakobyan, *Conformal dimension: Cantor sets and Fuglede modulus*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **1** (2010), 87–111, DOI 10.1093/imrn/rnp115. MR2576285 (2011c:30139)

[9] Juha Heinonen, *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. MR1800917 (2002c:30028)

[10] S. Keith and T. Laakso, *Conformal Assouad dimension and modulus*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **14** (2004), no. 6, 1278–1321, DOI 10.1007/s00039-004-0492-5. MR2135168 (2006g:30027)

[11] Leonid V. Kovalev, *Conformal dimension does not assume values between zero and one*, Duke Math. J. **134** (2006), no. 1, 1–13, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-06-13411-7. MR2239342 (2007c:51016)

[12] John M. Mackay and Jeremy T. Tyson, *Conformal dimension*, University Lecture Series, vol. 54, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. Theory and application. MR2662522 (2011d:30128)

[13] Pierre Pansu, *Dimension conforme et sphère à l'infini des variétés à courbure négative*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **14** (1989), no. 2, 177–212, DOI 10.5186/aasfm.1989.1424 (French, with English summary). MR1024425 (90k:53079)